

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3, 8, 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 3 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 16 and 18 – 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer in view of Johnson, II et al.

In response to the 112, first paragraph rejection of Claims 3, 8, 13 and 18, Applicants have canceled Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19. Hence, the rejection becomes moot.

Applicants have amended the independent claims (i.e., Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16) to overcome the 102 rejection made thereto. Specifically, the claims are amended to read as follows:

entering [[a]] the remote command on a command line in a local command interface, ~~said command to be executed by said computer systems;~~
(support is on page 12, line 31 to page 13, line 22 and box 6 of Fig. 6)

entering an address for each one of the plurality of remote computer systems in a group section in the local command interface (support is on page 11, lines 5 – 19 and page 13, line 23 to page 14, line 23);

sending the command for execution by the plurality of remote computer systems (support is on page 16, line 22 to page 17, line 22);

automatically determining, in response to sending the command for execution, whether each one of the plurality of each of said computer systems is accessible (support is on page 14, lines 24 – 30) accessibility; and

deleting the address of each one of the plurality of computer systems that is determined to be not accessible from the group section (support is on page 14, lines 24 – 30);

dispatching said command to the computer systems that are determined to be accessible in order for the command to be concurrently executed by each one of the computer systems whose address is left in the group section (support is on page 14, lines 10 and 11); and

returning a result of the execution of the command by each one of the plurality of computer systems to which the command is dispatched (support is on page 14, line 31 to page 15, line 3).

Applicants have added new Claims 21 – 24. Support for the limitations in the added claims is on page 14, line 31 to page 15, line 3.

Since support of all added limitations are in the originally-filed Specification, no new matter is added to the Applications.

By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, 5 – 7, 10 – 12, 15 – 17 and 20 – 24 are pending in the Application. For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of executing one remote command concurrently on a plurality of remote computer systems comprising the steps of:
 - entering the remote command on a command line in a local command interface;
 - entering an address for each one of the plurality of remote computer systems in a group section in the local command interface;

sending the command for execution by the plurality of remote computer systems;

automatically determining, in response to sending the command for execution, whether each one of the plurality of computer systems is accessible;

deleting the address of each one of the plurality of computer systems that is determined to be not accessible from the group section;

dispatching said command to the computer systems that are determined to be accessible in order for the command to be concurrently executed by each one of the computer systems whose address is left in the group section; and

returning a result of the execution of the command by each one of the plurality of computer systems to which the command is dispatched. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants submit that the claims, as presently drafted, are patentable over the applied references.

Meyer purports to display a method and apparatus for remote computer management using web browser application to display system hardware and software configuration. According to the purported teachings of Meyer, a controlling computer addresses a remote standalone computer system through an HTTP server. Once communication is established between the controlling computer and the remote standalone computer system, computer diagnostics are performed.

However, Meyer does not teach the steps of ***automatically determining, in response to sending the command for execution, whether each one of the plurality of computer systems is accessible; deleting the address of each one of the plurality of computer systems that is determined to be not accessible from the group section;*** and ***dispatching said command to the computer systems that are determined to be accessible in order for the command to be concurrently executed by each one of the computer systems whose address is left in the group section*** as claimed.

Johnson, II et al. purport to teach a system and method for evaluating the operation of a computer over a computer network. In so doing, Johnson, II et al. disclose a scheme that permits a user, such as a network administrator, to remotely initiate and control diagnostics of a node of a networked system. That is, Johnson, II et al. disclose a system in which a user may select a diagnostic routine that is to be executed. This diagnostic routine may instruct a managed node to collect configuration or other data and relay the data back to the diagnostic control, which may then be reported to the user. The data may indicate whether a malfunctioning application on the node, such as a print server, is "pingable".

However, just as in the case of Meyer, Johnson, II et al. do not teach the steps of ***automatically determining, in response to sending the command for execution, whether each one of the plurality of computer systems is accessible; deleting the address of each one of the plurality of computer systems that is determined to be not accessible from the group section; and dispatching said command to the computer systems that are determined to be accessible in order for the command to be concurrently executed by each one of the computer systems whose address is left in the group section*** as claimed.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1, as well as its dependent claims, are allowable over the applied references. Independent Claims 6, 11 and 16, which all incorporate the above-emboldened-italicized limitations in the above-reproduced claim 1, together with their dependent claims are likewise allowable over the applied references. Hence, Applicants once more respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the application.

Appl. No. 09/964,999
Response dated 07/30/2008
Reply to Office Action of 07/25/2005

Respectfully Submitted

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969